

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Attached hereto are two (2) sheets of corrected drawings that comply with the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.84. The corrected drawings incorporate the following drawing changes:

In Figs. 1 and 2, the legend "Prior Art" has been added.

It is respectfully requested that the corrected drawings be approved and made a part of the record of the above-identified application.

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 remain present in this application.

The specification and claim 1 have been amended. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Objection to the Drawings

The drawings stand objected to for an informality. Accordingly, attached hereto are corrected Figs. 1 and 2, in which the legend "Prior Art" has been added. Reconsideration and withdrawal of any objection to the drawings are respectfully requested.

Amendments to the Claims

Claim 1 has been amended for clarity. Support for this amendment can be found in paragraph [0007] of the originally filed specification. It is therefore respectfully submitted that no new matter is present.

Rejections under 35 USC 102 & 103

Claims 1-4 and 7 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Shimano et al, U.S. Patent 6,845,005. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Shimano et al. in view of Goodrich et al., U.S. Patent 5,375,076. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Shimano et al. in view of Tran et al., U.S. Patent 5,805,415. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Liao, U.S. Publication 2004/0021681. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Shimano et al. in view of Pollitt, U.S. Patent 5,198,991. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With regard to the rejection of claim 8, it is noted that this claim depends from claim 1 and it is therefore not seen how this claim can be rejected solely in view of Liao. Regardless, in view of this claim's dependence on independent claim 1, and as will be discussed below, this claim should also be in condition for allowance.

The patent to Shimano et al. fails to teach a base including a computer system and a flat panel display, as is recited in independent claim 1 of the present application. Referring to Fig. 1 of Shimano et al., this patent teaches a notebook including a display unit 10 having a display screen 14 and a display screen frame 16. The Examiner points out that the display unit 10 is the base recited in independent claim 1 of the present application. However, the base of independent claim 1 of the present application includes a computer system, which is lacking in the patent to Shimano et al. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the patent to Shimano et al. fails to teach or suggest the portable computer of independent claim 1, and its dependent claims.

With respect to the inventiveness, it is noted that, in the prior art, the computer system and the flat panel display are separated and the cover is integrated with the display (see Fig.2 and paragraph [0004] in the specification). However, in the present invention, the computer system and the flat panel display are integrated within the base. In other words, the flat panel display is not integrated within the cover, so that the cover is lighter than the base. Consequently, a cover with less weight can protect the flat panel display without any damage when the cover shelters the flat panel in a folded situation (see paragraph [0007]). The prior art is unable to exhibit this advantage. In addition, in the present invention, having the flat panel display assembled in the base and the input device assembled in the cover can facilitate electrical connection, so as to reduce the costs of manufacture and maintenance, and increase product reliability (see paragraph

[0034]).

The secondary references utilized by the Examiner fail to teach or suggest the portable computer of independent claim 1 and its dependent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC 102 and 103 rejections are respectfully requested.

Favorable reconsideration and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.


Because the additional prior art cited by the Examiner has been included merely to show the state of the prior art and has not been utilized to reject the claims, no further comments concerning these documents are considered necessary at this time.

In the event that any outstanding matters remain in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: June 19, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Joe McKinney Mundy
Registration No.: 32,334
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant

Attachments